

Remarks

Claims 60, 67 and 69 have been amended.

The Examiner has objected to applicant's claims 60, 67 and 69 under 35 U.S.C. §132 as introducing new matter into the disclosure. Particularly, the Examiner has objected to the "first group of management items," the "second group of management items," "first icon" and "second icon" as not being supported by the original disclosure.

Moreover, the Examiner has rejected applicant's claims 60, 67 and 69 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. In this regard, the Examiner has argued that applicant's claims 60, 67 and 69 contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. More particularly, the Examiner has argued that the "first group of management items", "second group of management items", "first icon", "second icon" are not described by the original disclosure. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicant submits that applicant's specification at pages 31-44 has extensive description that supports the above terminology objected to by the Examiner. Applicant specifically notes the following:

(a) the phrase "first group of management items" is supported by the items discussed in the specification and identified in the drawings, for example, as follows: 103a (FIG. 1), 804b (FIG. 8), 103-109 (FIGS. 1, 8, 14, 17, 19, 21, 22, 23 and 27). Specifically, "EXPECTED", "ORDERS DETERMINED", "DELAYED", "DIVIDED ORDERS," "ORDERS MODIFIED", "INSPECTION IN PROGRESS", and "ACCEPTANCE" having the aforesaid numeral designations are examples of the "first group of management items".

(b) the phrase "the second group of management items" is supported by the items discussed in the specification and identified in the drawings, for example, as follows: 904a (FIG.9), 110-115 (FIGS.1, 9, 14, 18, 19, 21, 22, 24 and 27). Specifically, "ORDERS DETERMINED", "DELAYED", "DIVIDED ORDERS", "ORDERS MODIFIED", "INSPECTION IN PROGRESS", and "ACCEPTANCE" having the aforesaid numeral designations are examples of the "second group of management items".

(c) the term "first icon" is supported by the items discussed in the specification and identified in the drawings, for example, as follows: 101 (FIGS. 1, 14, 17, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24 and 27), 801 (FIG. 8), unmarked box under 901 (FIG. 9). The "first icon" discriminates an existence of order-received processing.

(d) the term "second icon" is supported by the items discussed in the specification and identified in the drawings, for example, as follows: 117 (FIGS. 1, 14, 17, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24 and 27), 811 (FIG. 8), 901 (FIG. 9). The "second icon" discriminates an existence of order-placed processing.

Applicant therefore submits that the terms "first group of management items", "second group of management items", "first icon" and "second icon" do not constitute new matter and comply with the written description requirement, thereby satisfying the provisions of 35 USC §§ 132 and 112, first paragraph.

The Examiner has further rejected applicant's claims 60, 67 and 69 under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim applicant's invention. In particular, the Examiner cites the use of the term "such as" as indefinite and states that the limitation "wherein the display control . . . are not displayed . . . the second icon" in paragraphs 4 and 5 of these claims is unclear.

In order to obviate this rejection, applicant has amended applicant's claims 60, 67 and 69 as above set forth. Applicant's amended claims are thus believed now to particularly point out and distinctly claim applicant's invention, in compliance with the provisions of 35 USC § 112, second paragraph.

The Examiner has further rejected applicant's claims 60, 67 and 69 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Peterson, et al. (U.S. 6,324,522) patent in view of the Weicha (U.S. 5,870,717) patent. With respect to applicant's claims, as amended, these rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicant's claims 60, 67 and 69 have been amended to better define applicant's invention. In particular, amended claim 60 now recites a system for managing orders received from a first shop and orders placed with a second shop in which a communication means communicates data indicating statuses of orders received, and orders placed. Amended claim 60 further recites a display control means for controlling display of a first combination of a first group of management items which indicate statuses of order process from order determined to acceptance and each number of the orders received of the first group of management items, the first group under a first icon which is for discriminating the first group of management items as the orders received, and a second combination of a second group of management items which indicate statuses of order process from order determined to acceptance and each number of the orders placed of the second group of management items, the second group under a second icon which is for discriminating the second group of management items as the orders placed. Finally amended claim 60 additionally recites wherein the display control means prohibits the first combination to be displayed except for the first icon, in case where the orders received is not existence, and

wherein the display control means prohibits the second combination to be displayed except for the second icon, in case where the orders placed is not existence. Claims 67 and 69 have been similarly amended.

In applicant's claimed invention, as above set forth, the combinations of first and second groups of management items are displayed. The management items indicate the statuses of order processing (specification page 32, lines 3-6), and the display control means perform the display controlling according to the statuses of the processing. The contents of the display controlling specifies the characteristic display controlling disclosed by FIGS. 8 and 9 and the specification at page 37, lines 20-25. Such a construction is not taught or suggested by the cited art of record.

More particularly, looking first at the Peterson, et al. patent, this patent discloses a system for industrial maintenance repair and operation (MRO) for parts and supplies. In this system, orders for which a user has already placed to vendors can be checked by an Order Status Function. VIEW ORDER, ADD AN ITEM TO ORDER, SUBMIT ORDER, CANCEL ORDER, KEY WORD LIST, MANUAL ENTRY, SHIPPING INFO are shown in the step 328 in FIG. 15 of the Peterson, et al. patent as DISPLAY APPLICATION LINKS.

These display items do not indicate a progress of a processing status, nor suggest indicating the progress of the processing status. Therefore, the Peterson, et al. patent does not teach or suggest controlling display of a first combination of a first group of management items which indicate statuses of order process from order determined to acceptance and each number of the orders received of the first group of management items, the first group under a first icon which is for discriminating the first group of management items as the orders received, and a second combination of a second group of management items which indicate

statuses of order process from order determined to acceptance and each number of the orders placed of the second group of management items, the second group under a second icon which is for discriminating the second group of management items as the orders placed. Nor is there anything taught or suggested in the Peterson, et al. patent as to prohibiting the first combination to be displayed except for the first icon, in case where the orders received is not existence, and prohibiting the second combination to be displayed except for the second icon, in case where the orders placed is not existence.

Likewise, the Wiecha patent fails to disclose these features. More particularly, the Wiecha patent discloses a system for purchasing goods using an electronic catalog constituted on a computer network. The electronic catalog displays various goods as well as usual catalog informational magazines on the computer screen. A buyer can select some goods which should be ordered, from the display of the electronic catalog.

The contents displayed in the system of the Wiecha patent relates to purchase requests and nothing is taught or suggested in the patent as to display controlling of the progress status of the purchase requirement. Therefore, the Wiecha patent also fails to teach or suggest controlling display of a first combination of a first group of management items which indicate statuses of order process from order determined to acceptance and each number of the orders received of the first group of management items, the first group under a first icon which is for discriminating the first group of management items as the orders received, and a second combination of a second group of management items which indicate statuses of order process from order determined to acceptance and each number of the orders placed of the second group of management items, the second group under a second icon which is for discriminating the second group of management items as the orders placed. Nor is there anything taught or

suggested in the Peterson, et al. patent as to prohibiting the first combination to be displayed except for the first icon, in case where the orders received is not existence, and prohibiting the second combination to be displayed except for the second icon, in case where the orders placed is not existence. Specifically, the parts of the Wiecha patent noted by the Examiner, i.e., "abstract, fig. 6, 7 and 12, column 2, lines 38-49, 10, lines 38-44", fail to teach or suggest these features.


Applicant's amended claims 60, 67 and 69 thus patentably distinguish over the combination of the Peterson, et al. and the Wiecha patents.

In view of the above, it is submitted that applicant's claims, as amended, patentably distinguish over the cited art of record. Accordingly, reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

Dated: January 14, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

ROBIN, BLECKER & DALEY
330 Madison Avenue
New York, New York 10017
T (212) 682-9640


John J. Torrente
Reg. No. 26,359
An Attorney of Record